



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: 400 MISSION STREET, 9TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20536
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
09 899,467	07 05 2001	Michael T. Romanyszyn	L-0170,57	3416

7590 11 05 2002

LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTOPHER L. MAKAY
1634 Milam Building
115 East Travis Street
San Antonio, TX 78205

EXAMINER

REIFSNYDER, DAVID A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1723

DATE MAILED: 11 05 2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TC - 2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/899,467

Applicant(s)

ROMANYSZYN, MICHAEL T.

Examiner

David A Reifsnyder

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-23 and 38-44, drawn to a vortex nozzle, classified in class 417, subclass 171.
- II. Claims 32-37, drawn to a method of rotating a fluid in a vortex nozzle, classified in class 210, subclass 787.
- III. Claim 24-31 and 45-48, drawn to a fluid treating method and apparatus comprising a pair of opposed vortex nozzles for colliding a first fluid with a second fluid, classified in class 241, subclass 5.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the instantly claimed apparatus can be used to do a different method such as a fluid flow method where fluid flows through a passageway of a vortex nozzle without being rotated in the passageway.

Inventions I and III are unrelated separate and distinct inventions. Invention I is a vortex nozzle while Invention III is a method and apparatus for colliding a first fluid into a second fluid.

Art Unit: 1723

Inventions II and III are unrelated separate and distinct inventions. Invention II is a method for rotating a fluid in a passageway of a vortex nozzle while Invention III is a method and apparatus for colliding a first fluid into a second fluid.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the search required for all the inventions is different, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Group I contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species 1 corresponding to a vortex nozzle body including a passageway therethrough and a **plurality of ports** that inlet a fluid flow into the passageway. The examiner believes that the claims which read on this species are claims 1-12 and 38-41.

Species 2 corresponding to a vortex nozzle body including a passageway therethrough and a **tangential port** that inlets a fluid flow into the passageway. The examiner believes that the claims which read on this species are claims 13-23 and 42-44.

If the applicant elects Group I then the applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, none of the claims appear to be generic.

Art Unit: 1723

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement **must include** an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, **and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.**

An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Group II contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species 1 corresponding to a method of rotating a fluid, comprising inletting a fluid into a passageway of a vortex nozzle body via a **plurality of ports**. The examiner believes that the claims which read on this species are claims 32-34.

Art Unit: 1723

Species 2 corresponding to a method of rotating a fluid, comprising inletting a fluid **tangentially** into a passageway of a vortex nozzle body. The examiner believes that the claims which read on this species are claims 34-37.

If the applicant elects Group II then the applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, none of the claims appear to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement **must include** an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, **and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.**

An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over

Art Unit: 1723

the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Group III contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species 1 corresponding to a fluid treating apparatus and method comprising first and second opposed vortex nozzles, each vortex nozzle including a passageway with a **tangential port** that inlets a fluid flow into the passageway. The examiner believes that the claims which read on this species are claims 24-27 and 45-48.

Species 2 corresponding to a fluid treating apparatus and method comprising first and second opposed vortex nozzles, each vortex nozzle including a passageway with a **plurality of ports** that inlets a fluid flow into the passageway. The examiner believes that the claims which read on this species are claims 28-31 and 45-48.

If the applicant elects Group III then the applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 45-48 appear to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement **must include** an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, **and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.**

An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David A Reifsnyder whose telephone number is 1-703-308-0456. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda M Walker can be reached on 1-703-308-0457. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 1-


Application/Control Number: 09/899,467

Page 8

Art Unit: 1723

703-872-9310 for regular communications and 1-703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 1-703-308-3601.


David A Reifsnyder
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

DAR
November 4, 2002